

REMARKS/ARGUMENTSStatus of the Claims

In the Office Action mailed August 13, 2008, claims 10 and 12 are pending. Claims 10 and 12 were rejected. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 10 and 12 have been amended. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the specification and in the Figures. No new matter has been added thereby.

Applicants respectfully argue that the finality of this Office Action was made in error. The rejection of claims 10 and 12 under U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0118972 to Uenaka, et al., (hereinafter "Uenaka") was presented for the first time in the Office Action mailed August 13, 2008. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the finality of the Office Action be withdrawn and that the current Office Action be deemed a "non-final" Office Action. To that end, Applicants thank the Examiner for his telephone call with Applicants' representative on October 14, 2008. During this call, the Examiner agreed that the finality of the Office Action would be withdrawn upon receipt of a response to the Office Action, submitted herein.

In the event that the finality of the Office Action is not withdrawn, it is respectfully submitted that the following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action. All the pending claims at issue are believed to be patentable over the cited references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance (for all the reasons discussed herein); (b) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and /or consideration; and (c) place the application in better form for

appeal (if necessary). No new issues are raised as the amendments merely clarify and/or correct the claims. Accordingly, entry is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116.

Claim Rejections - 35. U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Uenaka. For anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or implicitly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present (M.P.E.P. 706.02).

Uenaka does not teach or suggest, at least, "wherein the automatic detection of the attachment or removal of the accessory is done regardless of the system state of the camera body," as recited in claims 10 or 12. Rather, Uenaka discloses that the detection is performed only when the camera body is switched on. (Para. 0052). Uenaka makes no mention of detecting an attachment when the camera is turned off.

Since each and every element, as set forth in the claim is not found, either expressly or inherently described as required by the M.P.E.P., Uenaka cannot be said to anticipate claims 10 and 12. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at (908) 654-5000 in an effort to resolve any matter still outstanding before issuing another action.

Please charge any fee deficiencies or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 12-1095.

Dated: October 14, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By



Rabiya S. Kader

Registration No.: 48,160
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant

916184_1.DOC